

**REMARKS**

The following remarks are responsive to the Office Action mailed July 12, 2007.

Claims 1-26 were pending in the present application prior to the current Office Action.

Applicant notes with appreciation that Claims 14-19 are in condition for allowance and that Claims 3, 5, 12, 13, 25 and 26 would be allowable if rewritten.

Applicant herein adds new Claims 27-37. Applicant avers that new Claims 27-37 are fully supported by the present application and that no new matter has been introduced.

Applicant makes appropriate amendments to the pending Claims and wishes reconsideration of the pending Claims in light of the following remarks. Applicant respectfully avers that all currently pending Claims are allowable in view of the prior art of record.

**Claim Objections:**

The Examiner objects to Claims 1 and 10 for the following informalities:

Applicant respectfully avers that all necessary corrective amendments have now been made.

**Claim Rejection under 35 USC 112:**

The Examiner rejects Claims 21 and 22 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Specifically, the Examiner states that it is unclear as how to utilize the invention when only the aspect ratio of subpixels in the second display is provided. The Examiner states that the first display should also be provided. The Examiner asks Applicant: “are the two displays of the same size or different sizes?”

As for Claim 22, the Examiner states that it is unclear how this figure of merit of 60% is derived and how does this further facilitate the making and using of the invention, as described in Claim 21. The Examiner finds that the specification is unclear on the concept and derivation of the FOM.

Merely for the purposes of advancing to allowance the remainder of the pending Claims, Applicant cancels Claims 21 and 22. At the same time, Applicant fully preserves all rights to continued prosecution of these Claims in the currently pending CIP to this case (US Serial Number 10/961,506), where these Claims are also pending.

**Claim Rejection Under 35 USC 102:**

The Examiner rejects Claims 1, 4, 6 and 11 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent Application Number US 2004/0195963 (hereinafter “Choi”).

Specifically, as to Claim 1, the Examiner finds that Choi teaches a display (OLED display; fig. 2) substantially comprising one of a first group, said grouping comprising:

R B G

G W R

wherein W is substantially white, G is substantially green, R is substantially red, and B is substantially blue (see Fig. 3C and page 4, paragraph 42; the 2x3 lattice uses two reds, two greens, one blue and one white subpixels).

As for Claim 4, the Examiner states that the R, G, B, and W subpixels (fig. 3C) have the same dimensions and area, thus subpixel rendering group does have colored and white subpixels comprising substantially the same aspect ratio (width:height).

As for Claim 6, the Examiner states that all the subpixels (fig. 3C) are rectangular in shape.

As for Claim 11, the Examiner states that each color filter is by nature a narrow bandpass filter.

As for currently amended Claim 1, Applicant avers that that subpixel rendering grouping as described in Choi is now deleted from Claim 1 – thus, mooting the present rejection.

As for Claims 4, 6 and 11, to the extent the Examiner's rejection is based upon the subpixel repeating pattern of Choi, Applicant avers that the present amendment to Claim 1 also moots these rejections.

**Claim Rejection Under 35 USC 103:**

The Examiner rejects Claims 2, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 20-24 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi and some combination of Official Notice and the following references: Masaki and Liu.

Applicant respectfully avers that, as Claim 1 (from which Claims 2, 7-10 and 20-24 ultimately depend) has been amended in a fashion that now avoids Choi, Claims 2, 7-10, and 20-24 are now themselves allowable (and without any additional argument as to their separate patentability).

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending Claims are patentable over the cited art of record and are in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejection and pass this application to allowance.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite the allowance of the claims, the Examiner is invited to contact Stuart P. Kaler at (408) 200-7387.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 14, 2008

By: /Stuart P. Kaler/  
Stuart P. Kaler  
Reg. No. 35, 913